

Appl. No. : **09/886,533**
Filed : **June 20, 2001**

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Applicant's attorney wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of conducting a telephonic interview. During this interview, the Applicant and the Examiner discussed proposed Claim amendments that if entered would overcome the art of record. Applicant submits that he has amended the claims in conformance with this discussion.

Appl. No. : 09/886,533
Filed : June 20, 2001

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 21, 22, 27 and 30 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,760,907 to Shaylor. Claims 5-13, 6-13, 16-20, 23, 24, and 28 were rejected as being obvious over Shaylor in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,683, to Killian, et al. Claims 14, 15, 25, 26 and 29 were rejected as being obvious over Shaylor in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,508, to Williams. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

In one embodiment, a client peer is configured to receive abstract hardware and abstract software byte codes from a service peer. The abstract hardware byte codes and the abstract software byte codes are converted respectively into native hardware byte codes and native software byte code[?]. The client peer has a client specific device that is hardware reconfigurable using at least in part the hardware bytecode. *See e.g.*, Figures 2-4.

Turning to the claims it is seen the Claim 1, as amended, recites: "determining an abstract bytecode by performing a compilation of an application for execution on a virtual device, wherein the abstract bytecode comprises abstract hardware bytecode and abstract software bytecode; transmitting the abstract bytecode from a service peer to at least a client peer; transforming the abstract software bytecode into native software bytecode that is executable on a client specific device; transforming the abstract hardware bytecode into native hardware bytecode, wherein the native hardware bytecode includes configuration information for a client specific device; hardware configuring the client specific device using at least in part the hardware native bytecode; and executing the native bytecode on the client specific device." Similar types of limitations are recited in the other independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art wholly fails to teach or suggest the usage of two types of abstract bytes codes, i.e., one for hardware and one for software and two types of native software byte codes, i.e., one for hardware and one for software. Shaylor

Appl. No. : 09/886,533
Filed : June 20, 2001

describes the usage of an abstract software byte codes that can be converted into native byte codes. *See* Shaylor, Figure 2. However, Shaylor fails to teach or suggest the usage of abstract and native hardware byte codes to configure the client specific device. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that this is also not taught or suggested by the other art cited by the Examiner. Killian merely describes processor design tools. Williams merely describes design tools for FPGAs. These references fail to teach the usage of an abstract hardware byte code to be sent to a client peer for transformation into a native byte code. Furthermore, these references fail to teach or suggest configuring a client specific device using the native byte code.

As discussed above, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the usage of two types of abstract bytes, i.e., one for hardware and one for software. Thus, in view of this, Applicant submits that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the usage of two types of native byte codes. In particular, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest how a client specific device is hardware configured based upon a native hardware byte code.

Since the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least the above-limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance.


Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/7/2005

By: 
Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550